

Appl. No.: 10/532,838
Reply to Office Action of: 05/03/2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond (US 5,015,197) in view of Etters (US 6,010,359). Claims 4, 9-10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond (US 5,015,197) in view of Etters (US 6,010,359) and Robert (US 4,740,867). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice and its features have been added to claim 1. Claim 13 has been cancelled without prejudice and its features have been added to claim 8. In view of section 7 of the office action, claims 1 and 8 should now be in condition for allowance.

In regard to claim 5, the examiner is requested to reconsider his objection to the claim in view of the amended language of claim 1.

In regard to claim 17, it has not been amended. Similar to original claim 2, claim 17 claims that the elastic element is connected to the second housing part and comprises a metal member with at least one spring strip sized and shaped to be located proximate the aperture. The elastic element is adapted to contact a side of the flat flex cable and push the cable outward into the aperture. Redmond and Etters do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 17. Redmond and Etters do not disclose or suggest an elastic element connected to the second housing part which comprises a metal member with at least one spring strip sized and shaped to be located proximate an aperture. Redmond and Etters do not disclose or

Appl. No.: 10/532,838
Reply to Office Action of: 05/03/2006

suggest an elastic element adapted to contact a side of the flat flex cable and push the cable outward into the aperture. The features of claim 17 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable and should be allowed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

7/17/06
Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

7-27-06
Date

Ann Oberstowicz
Name of Person Making Deposit